

FINAL HONOUR SCHOOL OF ANCIENT AND MODERN HISTORY EXAMINERS' REPORT 2020 DRAFT 2

Part I

A. Statistics

All candidates

Class	No						%					
	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015
I	13	11	13	8	5	7	59	52.4	68.4	42.1	35.7	46.7
II.1	9	10	6	10	9	7	41	47.6	31.6	52.6	64.3	46.7
II.2	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	5.3	-	6.7
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

All candidates, divided by male and female

Class	Number										Percentage (%) of gender									
	2020		2019		2018		2017		2016		2020		2019		2018		2017		2016	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
I	9	4	8	3	6	7	7	1	3	2	60	57	61.5	37.5	66.7	70	50	20	43	28.6
II.1	6	3	5	5	3	3	7	3	4	5	40	43	38.5	62.5	33.3	30	50	60	57	71.4
II.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	-
III	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

NEW EXAMINING METHODS AND PROCEDURES

- B. Candidates were contacted directly in April with the new agreed classification procedures for AMH, which were that both Ancient and Modern special subject gobbet papers were cancelled and other papers not already submitted would be examined remotely by the Open Book exam format. The ancient history sub-faculty decided not to follow the History Faculty's lead in having the thesis supervisor as a marker, and all AMH theses were marked in the traditional way.

Part II

A. GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE EXAMINATION

22 candidates (15 M, 7 F) took the examination. There were thirteen firsts (9 M, 4 F) and nine upper seconds (6M, 3F).

B. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY ISSUES AND BREAKDOWN OF THE RESULTS BY GENDER

The gender gap was very much narrowed this year, with 60% of male candidates and 57% of female candidates achieving First Class. However, as can be seen from the figures, the numbers in this joint school are small and vary each year in ways that have no statistical significance.

C. DETAILED NUMBERS ON CANDIDATES' PERFORMANCE IN EACH PART OF THE EXAMINATION

D. COMMENTS ON PAPERS AND INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

Roman History 146-46 BC (AMH) FHS 2020 Exam Report

10 candidates sat the paper, with 2 First class marks and nearly all the rest in the upper range of 2.1s. The scripts in AMH were generally of high quality this year, showing a good grasp of ideas from modern scholarship as well in most cases as an ability to engage analytically with ancient evidence. The most popular were questions 4 (on the desirability of citizenship before the Social War), with seven takers, q.6 (which asked whether politics in Rome changed after Sulla), with six takers, and q. 8 (which asked whether individuals or institutions permitted the outbreak of civil war between Caesar and Pompey), with five takers. The strongest answers to the citizenship question engaged closely with the period to which the question referred, and explored the components of citizenship and the extent to which it might have been attractive to different socio-economic or geographical groups. There was good evidence of attention to recent writing on the post-Sullan period in q.6. Questions on the fall of the Gracchi, slave revolts, the most impactful aspect of the last two decades of the second century for the rest of the period and attitudes to empire among ancient authors on the period had some take-up. Questions targeting specific types of evidence were less popular (with one answer on epigraphy and one on Sallust among AMHers, but no takers for numismatics, survey archaeology, or building work). Questions on gender and periodisation were similarly not attractive to AMH candidates this year.

E. COMMENTS ON THE PERFORMANCE OF IDENTIFIABLE INDIVIDUALS AND OTHER MATERIAL WHICH WOULD USUALLY BE TREATED AS RESERVED BUSINESS

F. Members of the Board of Examiners

Dr Charles Crowther (Chair)

Dr Anna Clark

Dr Aneurin Ellis-Evans

Dr Helen Gittos

Professor Steven Gunn

Professor Julia Smith

Dr Carl Watkins (External Examiner in History)

Professor Christy Constantakopoulou (External Examiner in Ancient History)